

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-39 remain pending in the application.

The Examiner mistakenly indicates in the December 9, 2004 Office Action that the application has 32 claims. Applicant respectfully submits that the application actually has 39 claims.

The Examiner indicates that the claims of the application are directed toward two patentably distinct species, and requests that the Applicant elects one of such species for prosecution on the merits. The two species are identified by the Examiner to be: A1 -- a method of forming circuit traces with an interposer with an opening; and A2 -- a method of forming circuit traces with an interposer without an opening. The Examiner indicates that there is no generic claim in the application.

Applicant elects to prosecute the claims reading on the species identified as A2, and submits that the claims reading on such species are claims 11-17, 28 and 37-39. Applicant also submits that claims 1-10, 18-27 and 29-36 are generic to both species A1 and A2. Specifically, claims 1-10, 18-27 and 29-36 do not preclude an opening in a recited interposer. Thus, the claims are generic to methods having an opening in an interposer as well as to methods in which an interposer is without an opening extending therethrough. The generic features of claims 1-10, 18-27 and 29-36 are evidenced by the fact that some of the claims reading on A2 depend from claims in the group of 1-10, 18-27 and 29-36 (for instance, claim 28 depends from claim 23; and claims 37-39 depend from claim 33).

Applicant respectfully requests substantive examination of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 12/16/2004

By: 

David G. Latwesen, Ph.D.  
Reg. No. 38,533